



PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application of:

Applicants : John Arthur Taylor et al.
Serial No. : 10/538,054
Filed : January 13, 2006
Title : POLYMERIC GARMENT MATERIAL
Docket : 050290 001P2
Examiner : Michael T. Piery
Art Unit : 1794
Customer No.: 33,805

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir/Madam:

INTERVIEW SUMMARY 37 C.F.R 1.133(b)

Examiner Piery is thanked for all courtesies extended the undersigned during the telephonic interview held on June 10, 2009. Primary Examiner Monica A. Huson was also present during the interview.

During the interview, the GB '103 reference was discussed. Applicant's attorney indicated that the amendment to claim 1, made after final rejection, further distinguished this claim from the GB '103 reference. More specifically, it was indicated at the interview that the GB '103 reference actually teaches away from the now claimed invention and that the GB '103 reference actually

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION

Please charge any fee necessary or due to assure entry to:
Wegman, Hessler & Vanderburg's USPTO Deposit Account No. 502431
Wegman, Hessler & Vanderburg
6055 Rockside Woods Boulevard
Suite 200
Cleveland, Ohio 44131
Telephone: (216) 642-3342
USPTO Customer No. 33805

-2-


criticizes the prior art fabrics that are coated with rubber latex. In fact, the GB '103 disclosure is directed toward a process wherein the rubber latex is left only on those parts of the fabric in which the yarns or the fibers intersect (i.e., in the knitted fabric set forth in the '103 reference, the rubber latex would only remain at the location of the interlocking loops of yarn). In contrast, in accordance with the instant invention, the coagulant is left adjacent the substrate in the form of a cohesive, porous and breathable coagulated layer.

During the interview, Examiner Piery indicated that he would review the Amendment After Final and consider the GB '103 reference. After the initial telephonic interview, Examiner Piery telephoned the undersigned and indicated that in the Examiner's opinion, the amendment to claim 1 after final would be sufficient to distinguish the invention over the GB '103 reference. However, the Examiner indicated, at that time, that the Amendment After Final would not be entered as, in the Examiner's opinion, it created new issues that would require a new search.

Respectfully submitted,

WEGMAN, HESSLER & VANDERBURG

By


Bruce E. Peacock
Reg. No. 28,457

Suite 200
6055 Rockside Woods Boulevard
Cleveland, Ohio 44131
216.642.3342

June 10, 2009